



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MA
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,487	11/13/2000	Rudy G Bonefas	003636.0098	4562

7590 05/21/2007
ATTEN: WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN
MANELLI DEMIDON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M STREET, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20016

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/709,487
Filing Date: November 13, 2000
Appellant(s): BONEFAS ET AL.

MAILED

MAY 21 2007

Technology Center 2100

William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/20/06 and 2/28/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 6-15-06.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows:

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection was withdrawn in the advisory action mailed 9/21/06.

The following rejections remain:

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 23-27, 30, 56-66, 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen.

Claims 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,116 by Namma et al.

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,975 by Nielson.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010716 by McCartney et al.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6430624	JAMTGAARD ET AL	8-2002
6877095	ALLEN	4-2005
6182116	NAMMA ET AL	1-2001

5899975

NIELSON

5-1999

U.S. Patent Publication 20020010716 by MCCARTNEY ET AL (1-2002)

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 23-27, 30, 56-66, 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen.

Regarding claim 1, the Jamtgaard reference teaches a system for deploying content to devices (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 40; col. 4, lines 34-39), comprising:

a translator operative to receive data sent from devices and to translate said data into a standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

a content provider interface operative to receive said data in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 32-37; content connection handler and appliance connection handler; Fig 4, tags 40 and 44) and to provide content data in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47 xml engine);

a transformer operative to receive said content data and to transform said content data into a format for a particular device (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine);

and state based information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30).

The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager.

However, the Allen reference teaches a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), because a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Regarding claim 2, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said standardized format is an XML message (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 3, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said transformer is operative to select a transformation based on a pre-selected format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63; rml) and to transform said content data using said selected transformation (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 4, the system according to claim 3, wherein:

said transformation is selected from a group of XSL style sheets (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 60- col. 11, line 9).

Regarding claim 5, the system according to claim 3, wherein:

said transformer is operative to select a plurality of transforms (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 60- col. 11, line 9) and to apply said plurality of transforms in at least one of: sequentially and independently, to transform said content data (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 12, line 65; example of html to rml page).

Regarding claim 6, the system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an extractor operative to access session information about a browser of said particular device (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 8, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said devices are wireless devices (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 87, the system according to claim 1, wherein:

said content provider state comprises a session token that said content provider needs to perform transactions on behalf of said devices (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35; authorized and identify user to allow access).

Regarding claim 9, the Jamtgaard reference teaches a method of communicating with devices that use different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 66- col. 5, line 6), comprising:

receiving first data from one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67);
translating said first data into a standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);
providing said translated data to a content provider interface (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 32-37; content connection handler and appliance connection handler; Fig 4, tags 40 and 44);
receiving second data response from said content provider interface in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47 xml);
transforming said second data into content type specific forms for the one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and
forwarding said transformed second data to said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 20, lines 63-65); and
state based information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30).

The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager.

However, the Allen reference teaches a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), because a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Regarding claim 10, the method according to claim 9, further comprising:

extracting information about said device from said first data (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 11, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

said extracted information includes device specific features (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; type of device).

Regarding claim 12, the method according to claim 10, wherein the transforming step comprises:

selecting an XSL style sheet based on said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63); and

using said selected XSL style sheet to transform said second data (Jamtgaard: col.s 11 and 12, the XSL stylesheet transformation).

Regarding claim 13, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

said extracted information includes information about a browser (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 46-47).

Regarding claim 14, the method according to claim 10, wherein:

said extracted information includes a message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-46).

Regarding claim 15, the method according to claim 14, further comprising:

selecting said content provider interface based on said message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 16, the method according to claim 14, wherein:

said message key includes at least one of a vertical market; an action; an action type; and a content provider identifier (ID) (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Regarding claim 17, the method according to claim 16, wherein:

said vertical market is a brokerage market, said action is a quote, said action type is at least one of a request and a response, and said content provider ID corresponds to a particular brokerage (Jamtgaard: col. 13, lines 51-53).

Regarding claim 23, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said first data is a request (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 53-66).

Regarding claim 24, the method according to claim 23, wherein:

said request is a hyper-text transfer protocol (HTTP) request (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-29).

Regarding claim 25, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said second data is a response (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 31-47; transmit to the requesting information device).

Regarding claim 26, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said standardized format of said second data is an XML message format (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 27, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said content provider is a third party (Jamtgaard: Figure 4, tag 13).

Regarding claim 30, the method according to claim 9, wherein:

said device is a wireless device (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 7-25).

Regarding claim 88, the system according to claim 9, wherein:

said content provider state comprises a session token that said content provider needs to perform transactions on behalf of said devices (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35; authorized and identify user to allow access).

Regarding claim 56, a method of communicating from a device to a controller using different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 5, lines 7-25), comprising:

sending first data from one or more devices using one or more transmission formats to a controller (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67); and

receiving from said controller second data using content specific forms for said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 64-67), wherein said first data is translated by said controller into a standardized format and conveyed to a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 59-64; col. 4, lines 61-66);

receiving said second data by said controller from said content provider in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47); and

transforming by said controller said second data into said content specific forms (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and

state based information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30).

The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager.

However, the Allen reference teaches a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), because a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to

include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Regarding claim 90, the system according to claim 56, wherein:

said content provider state comprises a session token that said content provider needs to perform transactions on behalf of said devices (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35; authorized and identify user to allow access).

Regarding claim 57, a method of transforming data (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 58-66), comprising:

receiving a message (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

extracting information from said message (Jamtgaard: col. 5, lines 1-6; col. 7, lines 44-47);

selecting transformation specifications based on said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 31-34, lines 46-61);

session managing to examine data content within said message and to identify and return state-based information comprising at least one of a hypertext history and a session token based on interactions between one or more devices and a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30); and

applying said selected transformation specifications and said state based information to said data (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 55-61)

state based information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30).

The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager.

However, the Allen reference teaches a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), because a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Regarding claim 58, the method of claim 57, further comprising:

retrieving said transformation specifications from a database (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 37-40).

Regarding claim 59, the method of claim 57, further comprising cross-referencing said transformation specifications in said database to said extracted information (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 37-48).

Regarding claim 60, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said message includes a message key (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 25-46).

Regarding claim 61, the method according to claim 60 wherein:

said message key includes at least one of a vertical market; an action; an action type; and a content provider identifier (ID) (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 40, 41; URL address).

Regarding claim 62, the method of claim 57, wherein said message comprises:

session information including at least one of a user agent and a device type (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 34-41).

Regarding claim 63, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said transformation specifications are specified as XSL style sheets (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 64, the method of claim 63, wherein:

a single XSL style sheet is selected (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 12, line 65; example of html to rml page).

Regarding claim 65, the method of claim 63, wherein:

multiple XSL style sheets are selected (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 65- col. 11, line 9).

Regarding claim 66, the method of claim 57, wherein:

said message is an XML message (Jamtgaard: col. 2, line 53).

Regarding claim 89, the system according to claim 57, wherein:

said content provider state comprises a session token that said content provider needs to perform transactions on behalf of said devices (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35; authorized and identify user to allow access).

Regarding claim 86, the Jamtgaard reference teaches a system for communicating from a device to a controller using different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 5, lines 7-25), comprising:

means for sending first data from one or more device using one or more transmission formats to a controller (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

means for receiving from said controller second data using content specific forms for said one or more devices (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 1-20);

means for translating said first data by said controller into a standardized format conveyed to a content provider (Jamtgaard: col. 6, lines 59-64; col. 4, lines 61-66);

means for receiving said second data by said controller from said content provider in said standardized format (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 48-58, lines 12-26, 31-47); and

transforming by said controller said second data into said content specific forms (Jamtgaard: col. 8, lines 4-7; layout engine); and

state based information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request (Jamtgaard: col. 14, lines 16-30).

The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager.

However, the Allen reference teaches a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), because a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Claims 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,116 by Namma et al.

Regarding claim 7, the modified Jamtgaard reference teaches the system according to claim 1, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider. The modified Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly disclose sending the data to more than one content provider.

However, the Namma reference teaches a composer operative to generate a combined response to a particular device (Namma: col. 4, lines 2-10) from a plurality of responses received to a plurality of requests provided to a plurality of content providers (Namma: col. 3, lines 45- col. 4, line 18) in order to allow concurrent display of many requests and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard to include a combined response as taught by Namma in order to concurrently

display of many requests at once and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56)

Regarding claim 29, the modified Jamtgaard reference teaches the method according to claim 9, wherein method of communicating with devices that use different communication schemes (Jamtgaard: col. 4, lines 66- col. 5, line 6), comprising: receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider. The modified Jamtgaard reference fails to teach sending the data to more than one content provider.

However, the Namma reference teaches a composer operative to generate a combined response to a particular device (Namma: col. 4, lines 2-10) from a plurality of responses received to a plurality of requests provided to a plurality of content providers (Namma: col. 3, lines 45- col. 4, line 18) in order to allows concurrent display of many requests and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard to include a combined response as taught by Namma in order to concurrently display of many requests at once and to reduces load on the browser (Namma: col. 30, lines 38-56)

Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,975 by Nielson.

Regarding claim 18, the modified Jamtgaard reference teaches the method according to claim 9, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider. The modified Jamtgaard reference fails to teach style sheets applied independently to the second data.

However, the Nielson reference teaches at least two style sheets are selected and applied independently to the second data (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36) in order to extend the capabilities of style sheets adding additional functionality and a much more pleasing and semantically consistent presentation for the user (Nielson: col. 1, lines 54-57; col. 8, lines 28, 29).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard to include two or more style sheets as taught by Nielson in order to extend the capabilities of style sheets and make a more pleasing presentation to the user (Nielson: col. 1, lines 54-57; col. 8, lines 28, 29).

Regarding claim 19, the method according to claim 12, wherein at least two style sheets are selected and applied to transform the second data (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 20, the method according to claim 19, wherein the style sheets are applied sequentially (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36; applied to a particular document by priority; col. 1, lines 54-57; cascading).

Regarding claim 21, the method according to claim 19, wherein an order of applying the style sheets is pre-selected (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 22, the method according to claim 19, wherein at least three style sheets are applied both independently and sequentially (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36; applied to a particular document by priority; col. 1, lines 54-57; cascading).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0010716 by McCartney et al.

Regarding claim 28, the Jamtgaard and Allen references teach the method according to claim 9, receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider. The modified Jamtgaard reference does not explicitly state querying a provider's database.

However, the McCartney et al reference teaches querying a provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020); and

receiving a previously registered XSL style sheet associated with said new content provider from the provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020) in order to optimize the web site for clients have different capabilities (page 1, paragraph 0007).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and providing data to a content provider as taught by Jamtgaard to include querying the provider database to get an XSL as taught by McCartney in order to optimize the web site for clients have different capabilities (page 1, paragraph 0007).

(10) Response to Argument

A) The finality of the office action issued 6-15-06.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The finality issue is not an appealable issue, it is a petitionable issue, which is a non-issue because the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection was withdrawn in the advisory action.

B) The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection was withdrawn in the advisory action dated 9/21/06 therefore arguments and remarks are moot.

C) Claims 1-6, 8-17, 23-27, 30, 56-66, 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,430,624 by Jamtgaard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,095 by Allen.

1) Appellant argues that Jamtgaard does not teach in any way identification of type of device originating the request.

In response the examiner respectfully submits:

The idea behind Jamtgaard is that a device that has limited abilities (such as a cell phone or pda, Fig. 1) can request a resource (such as a website) and the website is translated to fit the

requesting device's display abilities. The translator needs to know what kind of device to translate for so that the layout engine, XML engine, and content connection handler can format the content for the particular device.

The state based information taught in Jamtgaard is 'device information' used by the "layout engine in order to convert the RML data for display on the particular device" (col. 6, lines 45-47). Jamtgaard teaches an appliance handler may determine state information of the devices (col. 7, lines 44-45). Jamtgaard needs to know what device and protocol specific mark-up language formats it will need to translate for (col. 8, lines 4-8 and lines 50-61). Jamtgaard teaches content classification information used to determine what content and functionality are appropriate for which classes of devices (Jamtgaard: col. 10, lines 42-46). A class attribute allows different levels of content to be presented to different classes of devices which is illustrated in col. 14, lines 16-30 which shows types or classes of devices to be 1) Cellular telephones, 2) Palm Pilots and 3) Windows CE. Jamtgaard shows identifying 'a type of device' as identifying the classification of the requesting appliance, thus, Jamtgaard teaches the state based information as claimed.

2) Appellant argues that Jamtgaard does not need to use state based information to identify the device originating the request.

In response the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner agrees that Jamtgaard does not need to use state based information to identify the device originating the request; however, using the state based information in this manner is not claimed.

All the claims require is that state based information that can be used in this manner. Jamtgaard's device classifications have this information, so they meet the claim limitation (see response to argument 1).

3) The Allen reference fails to disclose state information comprising at least one of a type of device originating a request, a hypertext history, and a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source.

In response the examiner respectfully submits:

The Jamtgaard reference teaches the claimed limitation of state information comprising a type of device originating a request. Allen is not being relied upon to meet this limitation.

Furthermore, appellant's used of bold text appears to imply that he is arguing that the claims require a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source. This is clearly not the case. The claims use alternative language. The Jamtgaard reference meets the first alternative and therefor meets the entire limitation.

4) The Allen reference does not teach state-based information for session management.

In response the examiner respectfully submits:

The Allen reference teaches state based information for session management. The Allen reference teaches a session manager that maintains content provider state to determine whether the user is permitted access to a requested resource, such a web page. The state or status of the user's session are determined based on the identity of the user and the session-state token depicting the client's state with respect to the resource. The server generates a token that it sends to the client. Each time the client requests a resource; it sends the token with the request. The server then checks the request with the resource to determine whether the user is permitted to

access. The token compares the user of the request and the user of the token and “time slot” for expiration to determine if the token is still valid. The ‘token or cookie’ containing information on the state of the user with the user’s unique ID and state, is interpreted to be the content provider state (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35). The back-end information source is the requested web page that the client seeks.

Appellant argues the Allen reference does not store session-state information in a stateless network because it would impacts scalability, speed, efficiency, reliability, or security and thus contradicts the motivation to combine Jamtgaard with Allen. However, the claims do not specify where the state-based information is stored. The session manager of Allen identifies users and tracks the session state ‘to improve security that scales across a plurality of servers’ (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34). Allen still uses tokens to communicate and maintain state-based information but that the tokens are setup and stored on the client, eliminating the need for each server to store and retrieve session information from other servers (Allen: col. 4, lines 13-19). Allen’s session state manager examines data between the device and server to determine state-based information, whether the device is to be permitted or denied access to the content provider (col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35), to improve security that scales across a plurality of servers.

5) The motivation to combine is nonsensical and taken out of context.

In response the examiner respectfully submits:

The motivation to combine is reasonable and contextually proper.

The examiner contends that appellant takes a piece-meal view of the references, ignoring the broad and contextual application of each reference.

First, the Jamtgaard and Allen references are analogous in nature. Both references are directed to clients directing communications and requests to server resources. Jamtgaard shows clients referred to as ‘information appliances’ (Fig. 1, tag 5) that send requests for resources to Internet Information Providers (Fig. 2, tag 13) across a network. The Allen reference teaches a workstation directing communications and requests to a mainframe server (Fig. 1) across a network.

Second, Jamtgaard teaches a system for deploying content to devices and means for translating content based on the requesting device. The Jamtgaard reference fails to teach a session manager that examines content to identify and return state-based information.

However, the Allen reference is relied upon to teach a session manager to examine data content communicated between said one or more devices and said content provider interface (Allen: col. 13, lines 38- col. 14, line 35; session manager checks token) and to identify and return state-based information based on interactions between said devices and said content provider (Allen: col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2), said state based information comprising a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source (Allen: col. 6, lines 10-19; col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2; lines 31-35; the token provides session state whether the user is verified to access the requests resource=backend system).

The Allen reference provides proper motivation by teaching a session manager identifies users and tracks the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of receiving, translating, and transforming content as taught by Jamtgaard to include a session manager as taught by Allen in order to identify users and track the user session states to improves security that scales across a plurality of servers (Allen: col. 5, lines 24-34).

Lastly, the Jamtgaard reference is not unrelated to session management. Jamtgaard teaches an entity called 'application connection handler' that does performs comparable functions to a session manager because which brokers the entire transaction between the request device and provider (Jamtgaard: col. 7, lines 31-47). Jamtgaard teaches the application connection handler performs various security operations (Jamtgaard: col. 9, line 64- col. 10, line 5) which the Allen reference teaches provider state based information relates to. Jamtgaard teaches using a cookie (col. 6, line 43), which is substantially similar to Allen's token (col. 13, lines 63- col. 14, line 2).

D, E and F) Appellant argues that Namma, Nielson, and McCartney do not cure the deficiencies of Jamtgaard.

The board is directed to the issues addressed in C) which are repeated throughout the arguments in separate 103(a) combinations to each Namma, Nielson, and McCartney.

With regards to D), the Namma reference is not relied upon to teach “at least one of a type of device originating a request, a hypertext history, and a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source.” The Jamtgaard reference is relied upon to teach the argued limitations (see argument C).

With regards to E), the Nielson reference is not relied upon to teach “a session manager” nor “at least one of a type of device originating a request, a hypertext history, and a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source.” The Allen reference is relied upon to teach the argued limitations (see argument C). Nielson teaches the claimed subject matter of at least two style sheets applied independently to a second data (Nielson: col. 7, lines 31-36). Nielson is analogous in nature to the claimed limitation because it also translates and transforms data based on the stylesheets in order to extend the capabilities of style sheets adding additional functionality and a much more pleasing and semantically consistent presentation for the user (Nielson: col. 1, lines 54-57; col. 8, lines 28, 29). Appellant’s claim language is broad with regards to these claims and no where does it distinguish itself from audible translation.

With regards to F), the McCartney reference is not relied upon to teach “a session manager” nor “at least one of a type of device originating a request, a hypertext history, and a content provider state maintained for a back-end information source.” The Allen reference is relied upon to teach the argued limitations (see argument C). The McCartney reference is analogous art in nature and directed to solve the same issues as addressed in appellants disclosure. It teaches XSL style sheets with a database (both mentioned in Jamtgaard: col. 6, line 38; col. 10, line 21-56). The McCartney reference teaches querying a provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020); and receiving a previously registered XSL style sheet associated with said new content provider from the provider database (McCartney: page 2, paragraph 0020) in order to optimize the web site for clients have different capabilities (page 1, paragraph 0007).

Art Unit: 2155

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 2155

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Benjamin Bruckart/

Ben Bruckart

BRS

Conferences


/Saleh Najjar /

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



/Lynne Browne /